

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services



H6

DATE: **NOV 06 2012** OFFICE: MEXICO CITY, MEXICO

File:

IN RE: Applicant:

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under § 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen with the field office or service center that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink.

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the District Director, Mexico City, Mexico and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who was found to be inadmissible to the United States under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(II), for having been unlawfully present in the United States for more than one year and seeking readmission within 10 years of his departure from the United States. The applicant seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with his lawful permanent resident father.

The District Director concluded that the applicant failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. *See Decision of the District Director*, dated January 14, 2011.

On appeal the applicant asserts that he is his family's sole financial provider and that in his absence his father is suffering extreme hardship of an economic, emotional and familial nature. *See Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion*, received February 17, 2011.

The record contains, but is not limited to: Form I-290B and the applicant's statement thereon; various immigration applications and petitions; a request for evidence in support of the appeal; three hardship letters from the applicant's father; letters of support and concern from family members; and a letter from the applicant's former employer. The record also contains a Spanish-language letter from the applicant's father which is not accompanied by a full, certified English translation as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(3).¹ Because the required translation was not submitted for this document, the AAO will not consider it in this proceeding. The entire record, with the exception of the Spanish-language letter, was reviewed and considered in rendering this decision on the appeal.

Section 212(a)(9) of the Act provides:

(B) ALIENS UNLAWFULLY PRESENT.-

(i) In general.- Any alien (other than an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence) who- ...

¹ 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(3). Translations. Any document containing foreign language submitted to United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) shall be accompanied by a full English language translation which the translator has certified as complete and accurate, and by the translator's certification that he or she is competent to translate from the foreign language into English.

(II) has been unlawfully present in the United States for one year or more, and who again seeks admission within 10 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal from the United States, is inadmissible.

The record reflects that the applicant was admitted into the United States in July 2007 with a valid H-2B visa that expired on January 10, 2008. The applicant remained in the United States beyond his authorized period of stay before departing voluntarily in January 2010. The applicant accrued *unlawful presence from January 11, 2008 to January 2010, a period in excess of one year*. As the applicant is seeking admission within 10 years of his departure, he was found to be inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i)(II). The record supports this finding, the applicant does not contest inadmissibility, and the AAO concurs that the applicant is inadmissible under section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act.

A waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(9)(B)(v) of the Act is dependent on a showing that the bar to admission imposes extreme hardship on a qualifying relative, which includes the U.S. citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. Hardship to the applicant can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. In the present case, the applicant's father is the only qualifying relative. If extreme hardship to a qualifying relative is established, the applicant is statutorily eligible for a waiver, and USCIS then assesses whether a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted. *See Matter of Mendez-Morales*, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996).

Extreme hardship is "not a definable term of fixed and inflexible content or meaning," but "necessarily depends upon the facts and circumstances peculiar to each case." *Matter of Hwang*, 10 I&N Dec. 448, 451 (BIA 1964). In *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, the Board provided a list of factors it deemed relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship to a qualifying relative. 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565 (BIA 1999). The factors include the presence of a lawful permanent resident or United States citizen spouse or parent in this country; the qualifying relative's family ties outside the United States; the conditions in the country or countries to which the qualifying relative would relocate and the extent of the qualifying relative's ties in such countries; the financial impact of departure from this country; and significant conditions of health, particularly when tied to an unavailability of suitable medical care in the country to which the qualifying relative would relocate. *Id.* The Board added that not all of the foregoing factors need be analyzed in any given case and emphasized that the list of factors was not exclusive. *Id.* at 566.

The Board has also held that the common or typical results of removal and inadmissibility do not constitute extreme hardship, and has listed certain individual hardship factors considered common rather than extreme. These factors include: economic disadvantage, loss of current employment, inability to maintain one's present standard of living, inability to pursue a chosen profession, separation from family members, severing community ties, cultural readjustment after living in the United States for many years, cultural adjustment of qualifying relatives who have never lived outside the United States, inferior economic and educational opportunities in the foreign country, or inferior medical facilities in the foreign country. *See generally Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. at 568; *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627, 632-33 (BIA 1996);

Matter of Ige, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 883 (BIA 1994); *Matter of Ngai*, 19 I&N Dec. 245, 246-47 (Comm'r 1984); *Matter of Kim*, 15 I&N Dec. 88, 89-90 (BIA 1974); *Matter of Shaughnessy*, 12 I&N Dec. 810, 813 (BIA 1968).

However, though hardships may not be extreme when considered abstractly or individually, the Board has made it clear that “[r]elevant factors, though not extreme in themselves, must be considered in the aggregate in determining whether extreme hardship exists.” *Matter of O-J-O*, 21 I&N Dec. 381, 383 (BIA 1996) (quoting *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. at 882). The adjudicator “must consider the entire range of factors concerning hardship in their totality and determine whether the combination of hardships takes the case beyond those hardships ordinarily associated with deportation.” *Id.*

The actual hardship associated with an abstract hardship factor such as family separation, economic disadvantage, cultural readjustment, et cetera, differs in nature and severity depending on the unique circumstances of each case, as does the cumulative hardship a qualifying relative experiences as a result of aggregated individual hardships. See, e.g., *Matter of Bing Chih Kao and Mei Tsui Lin*, 23 I&N Dec. 45, 51 (BIA 2001) (distinguishing *Matter of Pilch* regarding hardship faced by qualifying relatives on the basis of variations in the length of residence in the United States and the ability to speak the language of the country to which they would relocate). For example, though family separation has been found to be a common result of inadmissibility or removal separation from family living in the United States can also be the most important single hardship factor in considering hardship in the aggregate. See *Salcido-Salcido*, 138 F.3d at 1293 (quoting *Contreras-Buenfil v. INS*, 712 F.2d 401, 403 (9th Cir. 1983)); but see *Matter of Ngai*, 19 I&N Dec. at 247 (separation of spouse and children from applicant not extreme hardship due to conflicting evidence in the record and because applicant and spouse had been voluntarily separated from one another for 28 years). Therefore, we consider the totality of the circumstances in determining whether denial of admission would result in extreme hardship to a qualifying relative.

The record reflects that the applicant’s father is a 60-year-old native of Mexico and citizen of the United States. He indicates that his entire family is in the United States with the exception of the applicant who financially supported him before his departure. The applicant states that he is his family’s sole financial provider, and a letter from his former employer confirms that he worked for [REDACTED] from January 2008 to April 2010. He explains that he is working for very low wages as an agricultural laborer in Mexico but has a good job waiting for him in the United States if he is permitted to return and support his family. The applicant’s father expresses great fear for the applicant’s safety in Mexico where the crime rate is very high and a relative was recently kidnapped and killed by the Zetas crime organization. The applicant’s father explains that he is very sick and desperately wants to have his family together again. The applicant states that his father is being treated for high blood pressure, takes a medicine called Seloken, and that he recently fell in the snow and injured his shoulder. He explains that his mother suffered a mini stroke last year as well, and he wishes only to return and take care of and support his parents. The applicant and his father indicate that other than the applicant’s immigration violations he has never violated the law, he is a person of good moral character, he is financially responsible for his parents, and he does not drink alcohol or use drugs.

The AAO acknowledges the applicant's positive contributions to his family and community as demonstrated by numerous attestations by others to his good moral character and deeds. The AAO notes, however, that the record contains no corroborating documentary evidence to demonstrate that the applicant's father is financially dependent on the applicant and has been unable to meet his financial obligations in the applicant's absence, that the applicant's father or mother suffer from any medical conditions for which the applicant's presence in the United States would provide relief or benefit, or that a relative was recently killed by the Zetas in an area of Mexico where the applicant currently resides and to which the applicant's father would likely relocate. Going on record without supporting documentation is not sufficient to meet the applicant's burden of proof in this proceeding. See *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)).

The AAO acknowledges that separation from the applicant has and will continue to cause various difficulties for his lawful permanent resident father. However, it finds the evidence in the record insufficient to demonstrate that the challenges encountered by the qualifying relative, when considered cumulatively, meet the extreme hardship standard.

The possibility of the applicant's father relocating to Mexico has not been addressed in the record and thus, the AAO is unable to speculate in this regard. The AAO notes that to consider whether the applicant's father would suffer hardship upon relocation to Mexico, an assertion must be made by him or the applicant to that effect and must be supported by corroborating documentary evidence such as country conditions reports for Mexico which address such topics as pervasive violence, the lack of employment and economic opportunities, and the lack of suitable medical care and facilities. As the record is silent in this regard, the AAO finds the evidence insufficient to demonstrate that the applicant's lawful permanent resident father would suffer extreme hardship were he to relocate to Mexico to be with the applicant.

The applicant has, therefore, failed to demonstrate that the challenges his father faces are unusual or beyond the common results of removal or inadmissibility to the level of extreme hardship. Accordingly, the AAO finds that the applicant has failed to demonstrate extreme hardship to a qualifying relative. As the applicant has not established extreme hardship to a qualifying family member no purpose would be served in determining whether the applicant merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility remains entirely with the applicant. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.